

224



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/687,100	10/12/2000	Carl Phillip Gusler	AUS9-2000-0401-US1	9974
35525	7590	12/09/2004	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			HOFFMAN, BRANDON S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2136	

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p align="center">09/687,100</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p align="center">GUSLER ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p align="center">Brandon Hoffman</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p align="center">2136</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Phone Interview on December 2, 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8 and 10-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8 and 10-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-15 are pending in this office action.
2. Pursuant to a telephone interview dated December 2, 2004, a new final office action is being submitted.

Rejections

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,041) in view of Hughes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,472).

Regarding claims 1, 8, and 15, Baker et al. teaches a method/system/computer program product in a computer readable medium for use in a data processing system for filtering incoming data from an external computer network, the method/system/computer program product comprising:

- A firewall that is coupled to said external computer network (fig. 1, ref. num 113);

- A server computer system coupled to an internal computer network (fig. 1, ref. num 112);
- A plurality of clients that are coupled to said server computer system, said plurality of clients being unable to access said external computer network directly (fig. 1, ref. num 107-109);
- Receiving, at said firewall, a document from said external computer network (col. 6, lines 8-12);
- Determining, by said firewall, whether said document is from a known blocked site (col. 6, lines 20-23);
- In response to determining that said document is from a known blocked site, blocking, by said firewall, said document without scanning said document (col. 6, lines 20-23);
- Determining, by said firewall, whether said document is from a known safe site (col. 6, lines 13-20);
- In response to determining that said document is from a known safe site, forwarding, by said firewall, said document without scanning said document, all of said plurality of clients being permitted to access said forwarded document (col. 6, lines 13-20); and
- Said server computer system being prohibited from receiving said document in response to said document being blocked (col. 6, lines 20-23).

Baker et al. does not teach in response to determining that said document is not from a known blocked site or a know safe site, scanning, by said firewall, text fields included in said document for pre-selected keywords; blocking, by said firewall, the document if any of said text fields include content that contains pre-selected keywords; or indicating that a site that sent said document is a known blocked site by adding, by said firewall, the address of said site to a filtering table.

Hughes et al. teaches in response to determining that said document is not from a known blocked site or a know safe site, scanning, by said firewall, text fields included in said document for pre-selected keywords; blocking, by said firewall, the document if any of said text fields include content that contains pre-selected keywords; and indicating that a site that sent said document is a known blocked site by adding, by said firewall, the address of said site to a filtering table (col. 14, lines 24-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine scanning the text fields of the document if it is not on an allowed/blocked list and blocking the document if it contains pre-selected keywords, as taught by Hughes et al., to the method/system/computer program of Baker et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because the scanning of documents for sites that are neither on the allowed list or the blocked list helps fill in the holes of a filter list (see abstract of Hughes et al.). This means that sites that have not been added by

an administrator (due to any number of reasons) can be added without the administrator having to search all the new sites that are published daily.

Regarding claims 3 and 10, the combination of Baker et al. in view of Hughes et al. teaches wherein the document is allowed to pass per standard service rules if the content does not contain pre-selected keywords (see col. 2, lines 41-46 of Baker et al.).

Regarding claims 4 and 11, the combination of Baker et al. in view of Hughes et al. teaches further comprising storing an indication in said filtering table of each known safe site that can be passed per standard service rules without having to be scanned for pre-selected keywords (see col. 5, lines 45-49 of Baker et al.).

Regarding claims 5 and 12, the combination of Baker et al. in view of Hughes et al. teaches wherein the step of indicating that a site that sent said document is a known blocked site by adding, by said firewall, the address of a site to a filtering table further comprises adding the address of the site to a "known-block" table when said site has sent a document that includes said pre-selected keywords so that the site will be blocked in the future without having its contents scanned for pre-selected keywords (see col. 5, lines 49-55 of Baker et al.).

Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. (USPN '041) in view of Hughes et al. (USPN '472), and further in view of Bauer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,241).

Regarding claims 6 and 13, Baker et al./Hughes et al. teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 8, respectively, above. However, Baker et al./Hughes et al. does not teach wherein the instructions for addition of a site to the filtering table are implemented in a strong text parsing language.

Bauer et al. teaches wherein the instructions for addition of a site to the filtering table are implemented in a strong text parsing language (col. 1, lines 11-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the instructions for addition of a site to the filtering table are implemented in a strong text parsing language, as taught by Bauer et al., to the method/system/computer program of Baker et al./Hughes et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because strong text parsing languages, such as Perl, are often used in web page development and are not machine dependent. This means that the addition to the filtering table can be performed on any platform.

Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. (USPN '041) in view of Hughes et al. (USPN '472), and further in view of Webopedia (<http://www.webopedia.com/TERM/C/cron.html>).

Regarding claims 7 and 14, Baker et al./Hughes et al. teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 8, respectively, above. However, Baker et al./Hughes et al. does not teach wherein the instance of the filter is periodically refreshed through a timed job on a Windows NT platform, a cron job on a UNIX platform, to enact the updated filtering tables.

Webopedia teaches wherein the instance of the filter is periodically refreshed through a timed job on a Windows NT platform, a cron job on a UNIX platform, to enact the updated filtering tables (definition of 'CRON').

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the instance of the filter is periodically refreshed, as taught by Webopedia, to the method/system/computer program of Baker et al./Hughes et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because periodically updating the blocked/enabled table of sites keeps track of the never ending change of the Internet. If updates were not performed, a site that was once blocked will never have the chance to be seen; the same goes for allowed sites.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2136

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brandon Raff

BH

E. L. Moise
EMMANUEL L. MOISE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A/U 2136